Environmental Review Initial Study

Application Number: 05-0781

Date: December 28, 2005 Revised February 9, 2006
Staff Planner: Matthew Johnston

I. OVERVIEW AND ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

APPLICANT: Don Hill, Department of Public Works
OWNERS: County Right of Way, David Allen Bowersock

APN: 041-052-17, 041-042-14
041-052-13, 041-042-11
SUPERVISORAL DISTRICT: 2

LOCATION: This project is located on Valencia Creek, between Soquel Drive and the culvert at the toe of Highway One, in the Aptos Area.

SUMMARY PROJECT DESCRIPTION:
The Valencia Creek Fish Ladder project consists of the demolition and replacement of a failed ladder and 2 existing culvert baffle systems on Valencia Creek. The location is the reach between the culvert under Soquel Drive and the culvert under the toe of Highway One. The purpose is to improve fish passage to over three miles of Valencia Creek. The project requires dewatering of two box culverts and the intervening 200 feet of channel.

ALL OF THE FOLLOWING POTENTIAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS ARE EVALUATED IN THIS INITIAL STUDY. CATEGORIES THAT ARE MARKED HAVE BEEN ANALYZED IN GREATER DETAIL BASED ON PROJECT SPECIFIC INFORMATION.

____ Geology/Soils	____ Noise
_x_ Hydrology/Water Supply/Water Quality	____ Air Quality
____ Energy & Natural Resources	____ Public Services & Utilities
____ Visual Resources & Aesthetics	____ Land Use, Population & Housing
____ Cultural Resources	____ Cumulative Impacts
____ Hazards & Hazardous Materials	____ Growth Inducement
____ Transportation/Traffic	____ Mandatory Findings of Significance
_X_ Biological Resources	

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

EXISTING SITE CONDITIONS
Parcel Size:
Existing Land Use:
Vegetation:
Slope in area affected by project: _x__ 0 - 30% __x_ 30 – 50% _x_ over 50%
Nearby Watercourse: Valencia Creek
Distance To: Project is in the Creek

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES AND CONSTRAINTS

Groundwater Supply: No
Water Supply Watershed: No
Groundwater Recharge: No
Timber or Mineral: No
Agricultural Resource: No
Biologically Sensitive Habitat: Yes
Fire Hazard: No
Floodplain: Yes
Erosion: No
Landslide: No
Liquefaction: No
Fault Zone: No
Scenic Corridor: Yes
Historic: No
Archaeology: Yes
Noise Constraint: No
Electric Power Lines: N/A
Solar Access: N/A
Solar Orientation: N/A
Hazardous Materials: N/A

SERVICES

Fire Protection: Aptos – La Selva Fire
School District: N/A
Sewage Disposal: N/A
Drainage District: Valencia
Project Access: Parcel 041-042-11
Water Supply: N/A

PLANNING POLICIES

Zone District: Parks and Recreation
General Plan: Urban Open Space
Special Designation:

Urban Services Line:	_x_ Inside	____ Outside
Coastal Zone:	___ Inside	__x_ Outside

PROJECT SETTING AND BACKGROUND:

Valencia Creek is a perennial stream within the Aptos Creek watershed in Santa Cruz County. The existing failed Valencia Creek fish ladder at Soquel Drive is the largest passage barrier in the watershed and limits salmonid access to the more than 2.75 miles of Valencia Creek between the Valencia Road PM 3.2 project site and Soquel Drive. The existing ladder was attached directly to the headwall of the culvert and has fallen off the wall. It is now buried partially in sand in the scour pool just below the culvert outlet.

At the project location, the creek's substrate is generally dominated by silt and sand. The subject channel is deeply incised into resistant siltstone bedrock, and there is a

moderate amount of submerged woody material in the reach between the affected culverts. The baffle structures in the existing box culverts are prone to snagging debris and tend to fill with sand, which renders them ineffective. Flows are forced away from the baffles on the side toward the flat culvert bottom. These extremely shallow and fast flows (0.5" – 1.0" deep) result in salmonid velocity barriers at both culvert locations.

The primary wildlife habitats in the vicinity of the project area are big leaf maple (*Acer macrophyllum*), red alder (*Alnus rubra*) riparian and second growth redwood (*Sequoia sempervirens*) forest. The under-story is dominated by cape ivy (*Senecio mikainoides)*, english ivy (*Hedera helix*), and periwinkle (*Vinca minor*) although some California blackberry (*Rubrus californica*) and stinging nettle (*Urtica dioica*) is present. Nearby surrounding lands are mostly developed and the riparian corridor is disrupted by major roadways, culverts and a steel trestle rail bridge. Topography in the area is hilly.

Valencia Creek and the Aptos Creek watershed are known to support both steelhead and resident rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and may support a coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) fishery.

California red-legged frogs (*Rana aurora draytonii*) have been identified within 5 miles of the project site, and a qualified biologist, approved by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), will conduct protocol level surveys prior to construction. There is also the potential for the yellow-legged frog *(Rana boylii*), and the Pacific pond turtle **(***Actinemys marmorata)*, two California Species of Special Concern to occur in the project area. The surveys will include these species as well.

DETAILED PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Proposed equipment access into and through the riparian zone will utilize an existing, private road. Access to the fish ladder site will require equipment to enter the stream downstream of the ladder and pass upstream through a CALTRANS culvert to the fish ladder.

Because the project involves the demolition and removal of the existing fish ladder, baffle systems and low-flow sill cutoff walls within the CALTRANS culvert downstream and within the Soquel Drive culvert above the ladder, a complete stream diversion/bypass system must be in place to dewater the reach. The proposed system consists of 2 cofferdams constructed upstream and downstream with approximately 600' of 18" HDPE pipe. Clean gravel bags, visquine and possibly small submersible pumps will be used to maintain clear bypass flows. The final design will be submitted by the contractor to the resident engineer for approval. Pipe size may vary depending on water flow.

Once the stream is dewatered, the existing baffles, sills and ladder will be removed and the new upstream culvert baffles and fish ladder will be constructed, with the

downstream baffles constructed last. All concrete work will be coated with a CDFG-approved sealant to prevent leaching of the concrete as it cures.

Staging and concrete cleanout will be done on existing roadway surfaces or adjacent upland out of the alder riparian zone. The equipment that may be used includes a small excavator, drill rig, loader, and/or backhoe. Throughout the construction period, the stream will be diverted and in-stream activities will be limited to the dewatered reach. Upstream work, above the culvert baffles and low flow sill will be limited only to temporary placement of the cofferdam and diversion pipe. Significant disturbance to upstream channel bed and banks is not anticipated.

Once the work is complete, the HDPE pipe will be removed and the stream will be allowed to run through the culvert baffle system. Concrete accelerants and surface sealants will be used to minimize the diversion period and limit potential concrete leachate contamination. All disturbed areas will be seeded with locally appropriate native species at the end of the project. The work to be done will be timed to coincide with the seasonal low flows in Valencia Creek, specifically July 1 through October 15th. All equipment will be out of the riparian area, the bypass will be removed, and the concrete fully cured or sealed by October 15th. Revegetation may extend beyond October 15th, depending on site and weather conditions.

III. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

A. Geology and Soils

Does the project have the potential to:

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
1. Expose people or structures to potential adverse effects, including the risk of material loss, injury, or death involving:				
A. Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or as identified by other substantial evidence?			X	
B. Seismic ground shaking?			X	
C. Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?			X	
D. Landslides?			X	
2. Subject people or improvements to damage from soil instability as a result of on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, to subsidence, liquefaction, or structural collapse?			X	

Following a review of mapped information and a field visit to the site, there is no indication that the development site is subject to a significant potential for damage caused by any of these hazards.

3. Develop land with a slope exceeding 30%?			X	

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
There are slopes that exceed 30% on the property. However, no improvements are proposed on slopes in excess of 30%.				
4. Result in soil erosion or the substantial loss of topsoil?			X	
Some potential for erosion exists along the access to the creek bed, however, this potential is minimal because all work will be conducted during the dry season and standard erosion controls are a required condition of the project. The access point will be an existing road from parcel #041-042-11 down to a bench just below the downstream culvert. This road is over grown with vegetation and partially covered with material from sloughing of the hillside above, and will require minor improvements. Prior to issuance of the riparian exception, the project must have an approved Erosion Control Plan, which will specify detailed erosion and sedimentation control measures. The plan will include a prohibition on winter access, and provisions for disturbed areas to be planted with ground cover and to be maintained to minimize surface erosion.				
5. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code(1994), creating substantial risks to property?				x
There is no indication that the development site is subject to substantial risk caused by expansive soils.				
6. Place sewage disposal systems in areas dependent upon soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks, leach fields, or alternative waste water disposal systems?				x
No septic systems are proposed.				
7. Result in coastal cliff erosion?				x

B. Hydrology, Water Supply and Water Quality

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Place development within a 100-year flood hazard area?			x	
This project consists of installing a fish ladder and retrofitting existing baffles set into existing culverts in the channel of Valencia Creek, and therefore within the 100-year				

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable

flood hazard area. All proposed work is replacement of existing structures and will not constitute any reduction in flood capacity. The project is designed to withstand 100-year flows and does not significantly affect 100-year flood levels.

2.	Place development within the floodway resulting in impedance or redirection of flood flows?			x	

The baffles within the culvert are to be retrofitted to improve fish passage. There will be no negative impact on flood conveyance. All proposed work is replacement of existing structures and will not impede or redirect flood flows.

3.	Be inundated by a seiche or tsunami?				x
4.	Deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit, or a significant contribution to an existing net deficit in available supply, or a significant lowering of the local groundwater table?			x	

This project does not impact groundwater.

5.	Degrade a public or private water supply? (Including the contribution of urban contaminants, nutrient enrichments, or other agricultural chemicals or seawater intrusion).				X
6.	Degrade septic system functioning?				x
7.	Alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which could result in flooding, erosion, or siltation on or off-site?			x	

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable

All proposed work is replacement of existing structures and will not affect the course of the river.

8. Create or contribute runoff which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems, or create additional source(s) of polluted runoff?	_____	_____	X	_____

This project will not result in any change to runoff.

9. Contribute to flood levels or erosion in natural water courses by discharges of newly collected runoff?	_____	_____	X	_____

No new impervious surfaces are proposed as part of the project, thus there will be no additional storm water runoff that could contribute to flooding or erosion.

10. Otherwise substantially degrade water supply or quality?	_____	_____	X	_____

C. Biological Resources

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Have an adverse effect on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species, in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game, or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	_____	x	_____	_____

*Kittleson Environmental Consulting developed a preliminary biotic constraints analysis for this site in November of 2005. This report identifies several listed species that may be present at the project site. Aptos Creek watershed is known to support both steelhead and resident rainbow trout (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) is believed to have historically supported a coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) fishery. In March 2003 the Aptos Creek mainstem received a planting of over 5,700 coho smolts from the Monterey Bay Salmon and Trout Project. Habitat loss due to heavy sand loads into the lower watershed and passage issues at the existing culvert crossings may be the critical limiting factors to coho recovery in the Aptos/Valencia Creek watershed. Prior to site disturbance, a qualified fisheries biologist will fence off and clear the project reach of all salmonids, relocating them to a predetermined suitable location above the project*

Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable

site. The project reach will then be isolated with cofferdams and routed low past the project reach through a flexible culvert. This work will be done in accordance with the conditions given in a Biological Opinion by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Agency (NOAA) and the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG).

*A review of the CNDDB and other records reveals the presence at least four special-status invertebrates known within 5 miles of the project site including the federally-threatened California red legged frog (*Rana draytonii*). Although a breeding site for the endangered Santa Cruz long-toed salamander (*Ambystoma macrodactylum croceum*) was discovered in 2004 near Aptos High School approximately 1.25 miles southeast of the site, the project is situated near the edge of the subspecies' range and no habitat is present at the project site. Potential habitat is present for two species of special concern, the foothill yellow-legged frog (*Rana boylii*) and Pacific pond turtle (*Actinemys marmorata*). One additional species of special concern that is rarely reported in the CNDDB, the San Francisco dusky-footed wood rat (*Neotoma fuscipes annectens*), may also inhabit the project area. Preliminary reconnaissance of the access route and site not reveal any wood rat nests in the proposed impact area.*

The 2005 USFWS RLF Protocol Guidance recommends a total of up to eight (8) surveys to determine the presence of CRF at or near a project site. Two (2) day surveys and four (4) night surveys are recommended during the breeding season; one (1) day and one (1) night survey is recommended during the non-breeding season. Each survey must take place at least seven (7) days apart. At least one survey must be conducted prior to August 15th. The survey period must be over a minimum period of 6 weeks (i.e., the time between the first and last survey must be at least 6 weeks). Throughout the species' range, the non-breeding season is defined as between July 1 and September 30. The search should be performed at least ¼ mile up and downstream of the project site. Surveys according to this protocol will be performed and if any frogs are discovered they will be removed from the project area according to US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) direction and monitoring will be conducted. (See attachment 2)

Daytime visual searches will be performed to detect western pond turtles.

A quick visual ground survey throughout the work area shall be performed for San Francisco wood rat nests during daytime RLF survey(s). If wood rat nests are present at the time of construction, they shall either be avoided or individuals shall be live-trapped and released nearby outside the work area. Surveys will also be performed for yellow-legged frogs.

Prior to the start of the construction, a worker education seminar shall be delivered, that will address all the special-status species that may be present.

Biological monitoring will be performed during hand-vegetation removal at the start of construction although daily monitoring may only be undertaken if red-legged frogs,

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable

yellow-legged frogs, Pacific pond turtles or other special-status species are found to inhabit the work area.

Steelhead trout and coho salmon are expected to be present in the work area. Prior to dewatering activities, all fish will be removed from the project area and relocated upstream to appropriate habitats by a qualified fisheries biologist. Based on channel conditions and the abundance of submerged wood, capture and relocation by backpack electroshocker is suggested. Consultation with NOAA Fisheries and CDFG will be undertaken and completed prior to issuance of a riparian exception.

Expert pre-construction surveys will also be performed for nesting birds. If special status birds are nesting either a suitable setback will be respected or the project will be postponed.

The purpose of this project is to enhance fish passage, and there will be a beneficial long-term impact on fish species.

2.	Have an adverse effect on a sensitive biotic community (riparian corridor), wetland, native grassland, special forests, intertidal zone, etc.)?	_____	x	_____	_____

The disturbance associated with creating access to the stream channel and operation of machinery in the creek will have a short-term effect on the stream bank and channel. It is anticipated that less than five trees, each no greater than 6 inches, will be removed. Erosion control will be implemented on all exposed soil surfaces prior to October 15th.

3.	Interfere with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native or migratory wildlife nursery sites?	_____	_____	x	_____

The proposed project will improve the movements and migrations of fish and is considered a beneficial impact. The Department of Fish and Game has requested that a variance from certain state guidelines for fish passage at certain flows be obtained in advance of beginning the project. The Department has indicated that they will work with applicant to produce a suitable final design. There will be a condition added to the project that final approval be obtained from DFG, to include any variance, prior to issuance of the riparian exception.

4.	Produce nighttime lighting that will	_____	_____	_____	x

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
illuminate animal habitats?				
5. Make a significant contribution to the reduction of the number of species of plants or animals?			x	

Refer to C-1 and C-2 above.

6. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources (such as the Significant Tree Protection Ordinance, Sensitive Habitat Ordinance, provisions of the Design Review ordinance protecting trees with trunk sizes of 6 inch diameters or greater)?			x	

The project will not conflict with any local policies or ordinances. Findings can be made to approve a riparian exception for work in the channel and temporary disturbance of vegetation.

7. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Biotic Conservation Easement, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?				x

D. Energy and Natural Resources

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Affect or be affected by land designated as "Timber Resources" by the General Plan?				x
2. Affect or be affected by lands currently utilized for agriculture, or designated in the General Plan for agricultural use?				x

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
3. Encourage activities that result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy, or use of these in a wasteful manner?				x
4. Have a substantial effect on the potential use, extraction, or depletion of a natural resource (i.e., minerals or energy resources)?				x

E. Visual Resources and Aesthetics

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Have an adverse effect on a scenic resource, including visual obstruction of that resource?			x	
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, within a designated scenic corridor or public view shed area including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings?				x

The project is located in an area mapped as scenic, due to the scenic corridor around Highway One. However, the entire project area is screened from the view from Highway One by dense vegetation. There will therefore be no adverse effects to the viewshed.

3. Degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings, including substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features, and/or development on a ridge line?			x	

The existing visual setting is riparian. The temporary access road to the creek will not be visible from Valencia Road, the disturbed area will be planted with native riparian species and will be indistinguishable from the undisturbed vegetation after a season's

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
growth.				
4. Create a new source of light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?				x
5. Destroy, cover, or modify any unique geologic or physical feature?				x

There are no unique geological or physical features on or adjacent to the site that would be destroyed, covered, or modified by the project.

F. Cultural Resources

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Cause an adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines 15064.5?				x

The existing structure(s) on the property is not designated as a historic resource on any federal, State or local inventory.

2. Cause an adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15064.5?			x	

Archeological resources are mapped in the vicinity of this project. However, this project proposes disturbance to be confined to creek bed and its immediate floodplain only. The staging area is located on a bench that had over 2 feet of sediment deposited within the past 10 years, and no ground disturbance is called for. Therefore, it is unlikely that any archeological resource will be disturbed. Pursuant to County Code Section 16.40.040, if at any time in the preparation for or process of excavating or otherwise disturbing the ground, any human remains of any age, or any artifact or other evidence of a Native American cultural site which reasonably appears to exceed 100 years of age are discovered, the responsible persons shall immediately cease and desist from all further site excavation and comply with the notification procedures given in County Code Chapter 16.40.040.

3. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal			x	

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
cemeteries?				

Pursuant to Section 16.40.040 of the Santa Cruz County Code, if at any time during site preparation, excavation, or other ground disturbance associated with this project, human remains are discovered, the responsible persons shall immediately cease and desist from all further site excavation and notify the sheriff-coroner and the Planning Director. If the coroner determines that the remains are not of recent origin, a full archeological report shall be prepared and representatives of the local Native California Indian group shall be contacted. Disturbance shall not resume until the significance of the archeological resource is determined and appropriate mitigations to preserve the resource on the site are established.

4.	Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site?				x

G. Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Does the project have the potential to:

1.	Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment as a result of the routine transport, storage, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, not including gasoline or other motor fuels?				x
2.	Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?				x

The project site is not included on the October 2, 2002 list of hazardous sites in Santa Cruz County compiled pursuant to the specified code.

3.	Create a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area as a result of dangers from aircraft using a public or private airport located within two miles of the project site?				x

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
4. Expose people to electro-magnetic fields associated with electrical transmission lines?				x
5. Create a potential fire hazard?				x
6. Release bio-engineered organisms or chemicals into the air outside of project buildings?				x

H. Transportation/Traffic

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Cause an increase in traffic that is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?				x

There will be no impact because no additional traffic will be generated.

2. Cause an increase in parking demand which cannot be accommodated by existing parking facilities?				x
3. Increase hazards to motorists, bicyclists, or pedestrians?			x	

The staging area is located on a private parcel well off the roadway. No disturbance of the road surface is proposed.

4. Exceed, either individually (the project alone) or cumulatively (the project combined with other development), a level of service standard established			x	

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
by the county congestion management agency for designated intersections, roads or highways?				

I. Noise

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Generate a permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			x	
2. Expose people to noise levels in excess of standards established in the General Plan, or applicable standards of other agencies?			x	
3. Generate a temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?			x	

Noise generated during construction will temporarily increase the ambient noise levels for adjoining areas. This noise will be generated in the creek bed, well below the roadway. Construction will be temporary and given the limited duration of this impact it is considered to be less than significant.

J. Air Quality

Does the project have the potential to:
(Where available, the significance criteria established by the MBUAPCD may be relied upon to make the following determinations).

1. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?			x	
2. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of an adopted air			x	

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
quality plan?				

The project will not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the regional air quality plan.

3.	Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?				x
4.	Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?				x

K. Public Services and Utilities

Does the project have the potential to:

1.	Result in the need for new or physically altered public facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
	a. Fire protection?				x
	b. Police protection?				x
	c. Schools?				x
	d. Parks or other recreational activities?				x
	e. Other public facilities; including the maintenance of roads?				x

		Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
2.	Result in the need for construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				x
3.	Result in the need for construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?				x
4.	Cause a violation of wastewater treatment standards of the Regional Water Quality Control Board?				x
5.	Create a situation in which water supplies are inadequate to serve the project or provide fire protection?				x
6.	Result in inadequate access for fire protection?				x
7.	Make a significant contribution to a cumulative reduction of landfill capacity or ability to properly dispose of refuse?				x

	Significant Or Potentially Significant Impact	Less than Significant with Mitigation Incorporation	Less than Significant Or No Impact	Not Applicable
8. Result in a breach of federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste management?				X

L. Land Use, Population, and Housing

Does the project have the potential to:

1. Conflict with any policy of the County adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	

The proposed project does not conflict with any policies adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

2. Conflict with any County Code regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?			X	

The proposed project does not conflict with any regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

3. Physically divide an established community?			X	

The project will not include any element that will physically divide an established community.

4. Have a potentially significant growth inducing effect, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?			X	

The proposed project will not extend the road or increase its capacity.

5. Displace substantial numbers of people, or amount of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?				X

M. Non-Local Approvals

Does the project require approval of federal, state, or regional agencies? Yes x No ____

US Army Corps of Engineers
California Department of Fish and Game
Regional Water Quality Control Board
Consultation with National Oceanic Atmospheric Agency

N. Mandatory Findings of Significance

1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant, animal, or natural community, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? Yes ____ No x

2. Does the project have the potential to achieve short term, to the disadvantage of long term environmental goals? (A short term impact on the environment is one which occurs in a relatively brief, definitive period of time while long term impacts endure well into the future) Yes ____ No x

3. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable ("cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, and the effects of reasonably foreseeable future projects which have entered the Environmental Review stage)? Yes ____ No x

4. Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? Yes ____ No x

TECHNICAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

	REQUIRED	COMPLETED*	N/A
Agricultural Policy Advisory Commission (APAC) Review			x
Archaeological Review			x
Biotic Report/Assessment		11/14/05	
Geologic Hazards Assessment (GHA)			x
Geologic Report			x
Geotechnical (Soils) Report			x
Riparian Pre-Site			x
Septic Lot Check			x
Other:			

Attachments:

1. Vicinity Map and Project Plans
2. Preliminary Biotic Constraints Analysis, Kittleson Environmental Consulting, 11/14/05
3. Letter of Jonathon Mann, P.E. , N.O.A.A., May 16, 2003
4. Comments rec'd during public and agency review period